

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,814	08/14/2006	David A. Jaeger	3309-03-004US01	7161	
110 7590 07/21/2008 DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL, & SKILLMAN			EXAM	EXAMINER	
1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			ASDJODI, MOHAMMAD REZA		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/21/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Application No. Applicant(s) 10/567.814 JAEGER, DAVID A. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit MOHAMMAD R. ASDJODI 1796 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status

# 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)∏ All	b) Some * c) None of:		
1.	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2.	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.		

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Information Disclesure Statement(s) (PTO/SSICE)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date   Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 1796

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

A surfactant compound of formula; [X-L-Z-L'-X']  $(A)_P$  Where: X and X' are:  $N^*R^1$   $R^2$   $R^3$  and  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^3$ , are selected from;

I- -CO2-

II- O(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>m</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>-, where

a)- m= 2-30 or b)- m= -O-( CH<sub>2</sub> CH<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>n</sub> R<sup>4</sup> where;

a')-  $R^4$ =  $C_{1}$ -  $C_6$  and n=1-100

III- Z a central head group selected from:

c)- b)-

Wherein  $R^5$  and  $R^6$  represent same or different  $C_{1}$ -  $C_6$  hydrocarbyl groups with two proviso regarding the Z', X, and X' selections.

Art Unit: 1796

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a <u>single ultimate species</u> to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims (1-16) readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: Identification of specific claims readable only on a single species cannot be clearly determined because of the presence of multiple functional groups having different chemical properties in various claims.

The following claim(s) are generic: no claim appears generic.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each individual species contains different functional groups which have different chemical structures, properties, and reactivities.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

Art Unit: 1796

requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during

Art Unit: 1796

prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

# Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. M. Reza Asdjodi whose telephone number is (571)270-3295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARK EASHOO, Ph.D./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 17-Jul-08 /M. R. A./ Examiner, Art Unit 1796 07/14/08